

Blocker, FL; Caleb Boyette, FL; Michael Braband, MO; Rodian Cabeza, NY; David Carne, OR; Daniel Chiew, Singapore; James Clifford, Ontario; Fredrick Cohrs, WA; Steven Dankers, WI; Johathan De Haan, KY; Nathan Downey, CA;

Daniel Falkenstine, TX; Andrew Farley, CA; Joseph Farley, CA; Steven Farrand, CO; David Fishback, Ontario; Benjamin Frost, MN; Eric Fuhrman, MI; Ron Fuhrman, MI; Rob Gray, IN; Michael Hadden, GA; Richard Hens, OH; Burton Herring, Jr., AL; William Hicks, CA; Nathan Hoggatt, TX; Mario Huber, PA;

Joshua Inman, OH; Jordan Jaeger, IA; Anders Johansson, WA; Aaron Jongsma, Ontario; Justin King, MI; Jason Kingston, TX; Richard Knight, AR; David Kress, AL; Luke Kujacznski, MI; Jeremy Kuvik, NY; Joshua Lachmann, IN; Mike Litteral, OH; Lucas Long, WA; James Lovett, WA; Joshua MacDonald, FL;

Gerard Mandreger, MI; James Marsh, NC; Timothy Mirecki, Ontario; Ben Monshor, MI; Benjamin Moore, MS; Timothy Moyo, GA; John Munsell, OH; Robert Nicolato, OH; John Nix, MI; Joseph Nix, MI; Steve Nix, MI; Sean Pelletier, WA; Keon Pendergast, AR; Joshua Ramey, CA; Elisha Robinson, PA;

Bruce Rozeboom, MI; Eric Rozeboom, MI; Gregg Rozeboom, MI; Mark Rozeboom, MI; Jason Ruggles, MI; Jonathan Russel, CA; David Servideo, VA; Chad Sikora, MI; Scott Stephens, MI; Kevin Stickler, NC; Nathanael Swanson, New Brunswick; Paul Tallent, NM; John Tanner, MI; Josha Tanner, MI;

Justin Tanner, MI; Joshua Thomas, OR; Jefferson Turner, GA; Roy Van Cleve, WA; Andrew Van Essen, Ontario; Christopher Veenstra, MI; James Volling, Ontario; Neil Waters, VA; Daniel Weathers, WA; Daniel Weed, NY; Shane White, KY; Nathan Williams, KS; John Yarger, CO; Chad Yordy, IN.

TRIBUTE TO JANEY SILVER—1999 MANCOS VALLEY HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment to recognize an exceptional woman. Janey Silver was named Mancos Valley Honorary Citizen of the Year for the year 1999. The Honorary Citizen of the Year award recognizes outstanding citizens who are not residents of the community for their service and commitment to the Mancos Valley.

Janey has spent over half of her life with children in the Mancos community. Commuting from Durango, Janey often arrives to work before 7 a.m. and stays late after work to coach the youth athletic organizations. Janey loves her job, and it shows. She takes on many roles as a teacher, counselor, friend, and role model for many. Repeatedly, Janey has gone above and beyond the call of duty.

After the spring of 2000, Janey will take a much deserved retirement. Undoubtedly, she will be greatly missed. She has touched the lives of many young Americans in the Mancos Valley throughout her career. So, it is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I congratulate her on this magnificent distinction and thank her for her selfless dedication.

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD A. DELGAUDIO

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD the following testimony offered in printed form to the United States Senate Armed Services Committee on October 22, 1999 by Richard A. Delgaudio.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Senators, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Richard A. Delgaudio, and I appreciate your taking the time today to review my testimony which I have been told will be recorded in the official transcript of today's U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee proceedings. As I submit this testimony, I place my hand on my Catholic bible and swear that this is the truth as I know it, and I dedicate these words to His name.

I have served during the twelve years' existence of National Security Center as its President, have sponsored four fact-finding trips to Panama and have personally participated in an additional four such trips. I have done research on, have spoken before audiences from one end of this country to the other, from Florida to New York to Washington, DC to California to Ohio to points in between, and have written and published articles, newsletters and books on this topic. I have been on more than 100 radio talk shows on this subject matter. I am the publisher of Captain G. Russell Evans' Death Knell of the Panama Canal? and author of Peril in Panama, both published by National Security Center, with a combined distribution of 1.2 million. I have published Panama Alert newsletter for the past ten years. And I coined a phrase you may have already heard, and will be hearing more of in the future: China is the new "Gatekeeper" of the Panama Canal.

I come before you today as an unabashed critic of the current policy of the United States towards Panama. I come before you in full agreement with the warning one year ago of Admiral Thomas Moorer, USN (Ret.) before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Admiral Moorer testified that unless the current U.S. policy towards Panama is changed, then there could be "big trouble" in Panama, trouble that could lead to a military confrontation.

I had earnestly desired to give you this testimony in person today, and also to personally present to the Committee the quarter of a million signed petitions from Americans from all across the land who are very concerned about current U.S. policy and pray that you see fit to reverse it.

As Senators know, there have been occasions in the history of the relationship between Panama and the United States, in which American Presidents have felt it necessary to put our boys into harms way at the Panama Canal to defend the national security interest of the United States. Some of those boys paid the ultimate price for following their orders and doing their duty. Two dozen in Operation Just Cause, not very long ago. National Security Center will, within the next three weeks, be publishing a Panama Canal Calendar 2000 which cites other dates where U.S. servicemen put their lives on the line in Panama.

I cannot believe that those American soldiers, airmen, sailors and marines who died, who returned home wounded, and all those who served, did this service for their country, following the orders of mistaken Presidents. I firmly believe that those orders they

were given, especially orders given in that Just Cause, were proper and right, both for the interest of our country and for the long term interests of the people of Panama and the United States.

And so it is with some trepidation that I offer this testimony today, for I fear that if my warning, and the warning of my esteemed colleagues offering the Committee testimony today, Admiral Thomas Moorer, USN (Ret.) Captain G. Russell Evans, USCG (Ret.) and Bruce Fein, Esq., is not heeded, then a higher casualty rate will be suffered by American servicemen in a future Operation Just Cause to keep the Panama Canal open, operational and secure. My focus in today's testimony is on the question Senator Trent Lott asked the Committee to focus on, "Does Hutchison-Whampoa's Chairman, billionaire Li Ka-shing, have ties to the Chinese Communist Party, China's People's Liberation Army, or Chinese intelligence activities."

My testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee is: yes, Li Ka-shing does have strong ties to the Chinese Communists. Li Ka-shing is China's Red billionaire, and he has enabled his masters in Beijing to become the new Gatekeeper of the Panama Canal. On December 31 (or perhaps on December 14) of this year, China will, through Li Ka-shing, be the uncontested, unchallenged, unwatched Gatekeeper of the Panama Canal. Further, my testimony is: the government of the United States has known all along about Li Ka-shing's ties to Communist China, a self-proclaimed enemy of the United States, and has offered no resistance whatsoever to that government's now-successful move to control the entrance and exit ports of the Panama Canal.

The information that we have developed about Li Ka-shing, China's Red billionaire, is mostly available in the public record. Much of it has been collected and reported in my book, Peril in Panama. Li Ka-shing is much more than the elusive Hong Kong billionaire businessman that he has been portrayed as. He has for many years also been one of the most trusted allies of the Communist Chinese, well before they took over Hong Kong, his base of operations.

Li Ka-shing's influence is quiet, behind the scenes and decisive. Shortly after his company took over in the Bahamas, that country withdrew its recognition of Free China and recognized Communist China. Do the Senators believe in such coincidences?

Li Ka-shing's relationship with the rulers of the Peoples Republic of China goes back to the 1970's with Deng Xiaoping. When Li Ka-shing received an honorary degree from Beijing University, on April 28, 1992, it was handed to him by none other than Jian Zemin, the current dictator of the PRC.

Why such an honor for Li Ka-shing? Simple. In the words of Anthony B. Chan (Li Ka-shing: Hong Kong's Elusive Billionaire), "Li was the vital go-between that the geriatric bosses of Beijing needed to firm up the support of Hong Kong's other leading merchants in the smooth recovery of the colony to China in 1997."

Li was very useful to the PRC in the takeover of Hong Kong. He was always loyal to their cause, never critical. For example: "I was of course saddened (by the Tiananmen massacre). But as a Chinese, China is my motherland. No matter what happened, I am still willing to work for the future of my country."

Senators need to understand fully, that these are Li Ka-shing's words giving the lie to those who say he is simply a Hong Kong billionaire: "As a Chinese, China is my motherland" (page 5, Li Ka-shing book).

If he were just another Hong Kong businessman, how did Li Ka-shing, in 1979, become a member of the China International

Trust and Investment Corporation (CITIC)? CITIC is Communist China's top investment arm and the bank of the People's Liberation Army. CITIC provides financing for Chinese army weapons sales and finances the purchase of Western technology through a variety of fronts. Li will of course deny that his membership in the PRC's top government investment arm meant he was allied with the PRC. But that was his path to power. Li parleyed this association with Chinese power brokers into the purchase of a controlling share in Hutchison-Whampoa, which led to his becoming a billionaire.

If he were not in the PRC's hip pocket, would Li Ka-shing be running their commercial ports? Would he be running most of south China's sea born trade? A Journal of Commerce report by Joe Studwell reported that Li Ka-shing has a "cozy relationship" with the Peoples Republic of China that is as "close as lips and teeth." Li Ka-shing was appointed a member of the Preparatory Committee that oversaw Beijing's takeover of Hong Kong in 1997. Among other things, the committee eliminated the recently elected sixty-person legislature, replacing it with puppets more helpful to the PRC.

There is ample evidence of the ties of Li Ka-shing to Communist China. Here are several, some reported in my book, *Peril in Panama*:

Li has "tried to secure CPPCC membership (Chinese Peoples Political Consultative Conference) for his eldest son and heir apparent, Victor Li Tzar-Kuoi, to keep contacts with the top brass in Beijing." (Nikkei Weekly, 3/2/98).

Nikkei Weekly reported that Li Ka-shing "converted to the pro-China camp in the late 1980's" and was "helping Chinese companies affiliated with the People's Liberation Army enter the Hong Kong market."

Senators are no doubt familiar with the Cox Report from the other chamber, where there is ample documentation to demonstrate to even the most skeptical how apparently private businesses are used by the PRC as an arm of policy in countries like the United States.

Li Ka-shing "posted congratulatory messages" in a daily Hong Kong newspaper operated by the PRC after their takeover of the city (Asian Political News, 10/13/97).

When PRC leaders came to Hong Kong to oversee their takeover, their good and faithful servant, Li Ka-shing, rolled out the red carpet (pardon the pun) for them. Naturally, PRC leader Jiang Zemin stayed at one of Li's hotels during the festivities. Many in the PRC delegation skipped official British dinner ceremonies to dine with Li at one of his hotels. Li stood with Jiang Zemin in a place of honor during handover ceremonies but, skipped subsequent celebrations because "he is a target for pro-democracy activists." (The Independent of London, 7/1/97).

The Guardian of London (6/11/97) reported that Li and his PRC allies are so powerful "that even governments on the other side of the world must reckon with their clout. A recent decision by the Bahamas to sever diplomatic ties with Beijing is widely thought to have been motivated by concern over a newly opened port run by Hutchinson-Whampoa, Ltd., a Hong Kong conglomerate controlled by Mr. Li, pro-China mogul."

If he had that much influence in the near-by Bahamas, why would Senators suppose the "pro-China mogul" would do any less in further-away and much more important Panama?

Asian Business (3/97) reports on Li Ka-shing's views on the PRC leadership: "Yes, I strongly believe in what they say."

If Li Ka-shing is given the order to slow down, shut down, damage or even destroy the Panama Canal in some future United States-

China confrontation or any type of emergency where United States troops, supplies and jet fuel are being rushed through the Panama Canal, will he say "Yes, I believe in what they say?"

Senators may suppose that some successful businessmen put the interest of their business ahead of anything else, including national interest. But putting the interest of the PRC first has always been the best thing for the business of Li Ka-shing. Why would Senators suppose that might change in the future, at the Panama Canal?

But let me provide more documentation.

Li Ka-shing proudly serves as "an advisor on Hong Kong affairs to the Beijing government and has served on the Selection Committee that picked Tung Chee-hwa" as Hong Kong's new top boss (Asian Business).

I have a picture of Ronald Reagan hanging proudly in my office. If Li Ka-shing is just a Hong Kong businessman, why does he have a picture of the PRC dictator, Jiang Zemin, hanging in his? (The Financial Times, 3/13/98).

Press reports say Li publicly mourned the death of PRC dictator Deng Xiaoping the day after he died (Agence France Presse, 2/20-21, 1997).

"The Chinese Communist leaders turned for help to the benevolent figure of a Hong Kong property billionaire, Li Ka-shing." (Sunday Times, 6/30/96).

Hutchison-Whampoa "is a partner with China Ocean Shipping Company (COSCO) in several enterprises in China and elsewhere in Asia." COSCO has long since been identified as an arm of the People's Liberation Army, totally controlled by the communist government of China. One United States Senator advises constituents that he is very wary of COSCO but does not see the same problem with Hutchinson-Whampoa. Why not? They are in the same bed, under the same blanket, and operators for the same cause.

An unidentified State Department spokesman "noted that Hutchison has ventures in Asia with state-run China Ocean Shipping Company" (Journal of Commerce, 3/26/97).

Companies wanting to do business in China know who to cozy up to. USA Today (1/13/98) reported a company called Peregrine leveraged "their close ties to Hong Kong billionaire Li Ka-shing to gain the trust of Chinese leaders."

Proctor and Gamble's chairman and CEO, said "Hutchison has been and will continue to be a valuable partner in building our business in China." (The Kentucky Post, 10/24/97).

Li Ka-shing's dealings with the PRC are quite extensive. Besides his Hong Kong dealings—all at the sufferance of the government of Beijing, Li has financed several satellite deals between the U.S. Hughes Corporation and China Hong Kong Satellite, a company owned by the PLA's COSTIND. Li has put more than a billion dollars into China. He owns most of the piers in Hong Kong, has the exclusive right of first refusal of all PRC ports south of the Yangtze River.

We congratulate Senators who acted to block the PLA's agent, COSCO, from gaining control of the military port of Long Beach, California. But you might want to go back and check your files a little further. You will find that it was Li Ka-shing who was involved in that deal up to his eyeballs, trying to help his friends and associates at COSCO and the Chinese navy. Li Ka-shing's son and heir apparent, Victor Li Tzar-kuoi recently boasted about another milestone for his and dad's business operations, a \$957 million deal. This is the PLA's biggest investment yet in America. Li and his PLA partners, report WorldNetDaily (6/29/99), have "bought their way in to the communications grid of north-east America . . . Hutchison Telecom and the PLA are now major players in the American

mobile-phone business with the recent investment of nearly \$1 billion into Voice Stream Wireless."

"Li is so close to the Chinese government that the Clinton White House included his bio along with Chinese President Jiang Zemin to the CEO of Loral Aerospace, Bernard Schwartz, just prior to the 1994 Ron Brown trade trip to Beijing. According to documents provided by the Commerce Department, Brown and Schwartz were to meet both Li and Gen. Shen Roujun of CONSTIND." (NetNewsDaily, 6/29/99).

Senators, it does not take a lot of research to know what is going on in Panama with Li Ka-shing and Hutchison-Whampoa. Those in the know in Panama are aware that the future of Panama is China, that hope for jobs in the future is with China. They know that to criticize Li Ka-shing or Hutchison-Whampoa in a country they dominate means a problem finding work in the future. I found this to be true whether I was speaking to high powered, well-connected, financially secure individuals such as Panama's businessmen, lawyers, bankers, or down-to-earth people who work with their hands and just want to feed their families and have a future for their children. If the United States is leaving and this Li Ka-shing is our future, the thinking at all levels goes, then we'd best not criticize him.

So don't go to Panama to have cocktails with the financially successful, the well connected, the ruling power elite, and think you'll find out about Hutchison-Whampoa and Li Ka-shing. I urge the Armed Services Committee and indeed the entire U.S. Congress, to investigate carefully the past, present and the future plans of this Li Ka-shing, China's Red Billionaire. He is on the verge of his greatest triumph for his masters in Beijing, at the Panama Canal.

I hope and pray that Congress will see fit not merely to have a few hours hearing and publish a transcript of the proceedings, but to undertake a serious investigation of what is afoot at the Panama Canal, and how in the world can the President say that his policy is advancing the best interest of the United States?

I said at the start, that in my view, Li Ka-shing and his Hutchison Whampoa company, disguised in Panama as "Panama Ports Company" is a tool of Communist China. And I said that I believe the government of the United States has known about this all along, and despite this advance knowledge, has allowed this man, and thus his masters, to gain control of the entrance-exit ports of the Panama Canal.

First of all, consider that virtually all of the information I have shared with Senators in today's testimony, has been available in the public record, most of it prior to the January, 1997 date that Hutchison-Whampoa become the Gatekeeper of the Panama Canal.

Further, the organization I serve as President, National Security Center, filed a Freedom of Information Act Request nearly two years ago with the Central Intelligence Agency, after reading some of these reports, including one that said that our own CIA had a file showing the connections between Communist China and Li Ka-shing.

I thought back then, when we filed that Freedom of Information Act request to the CIA, that the American people have a right to know whether their government handed this knife at the throat of the United States, over to Red China on a silver platter?

But I got back a letter from the Central Intelligence Agency, and they didn't agree with me. They said, and I quote, 'it is not in the national security interest of the United States to confirm or deny the existence of the documents you have requested.'

We pressed on. National Security Center filed an appeal. And a few months later, we

got a reply. The Review board, having carefully considered our request, had this to say: "It is not in the national security interest of the United States, to confirm or deny the existence of the documents you have requested."

Senators, I conclude my testimony today, by suggesting to you that I have yet to hear any possible reason why it would not be in the national security interest of the United States for you and for the American people to learn the truth about Li Ka-shing and his ties to Red China, the new Gatekeeper of the Panama Canal. It is very important to the national security interests of our country, with no threat to the sovereignty, freedom and future prosperity of our good friends in Panama who I respect and appreciate, if we all learned the truth about Li Ka-shing, and if the U.S. Congress forced a change in the current policy of the United States at Panama.

I have reported in my book, about the prospects for a new missile crisis in Panama. China currently has added to its inventory of 18 ICBMS, the majority aimed our way. Senators are aware that they have many more short range and intermediate range nuclear missiles—148 at last count, and growing. It is so farfetched to imagine some of those missiles being quietly put on container ships and offloaded at the Hutchison-Whampoa port facilities?

These are the same people that managed to get 2,000 AK47 rifles smuggled into the United States. The same people who are smuggling drugs (through their growing Red-China controlled gang connection to the FARC narco-guerrillas to the North in Colombia) into Panama and illegals into Panama. Why not a couple dozen intermediate range and/or short range nuclear missiles? Can you imagine the next "Cuban missile crisis" taking place after the missiles have all been set up? Or worse, after they have all been fired?

This scenario has been confirmed as a possibility by Admiral Thomas Moorer, USN (Ret.), and by a former commander of all U.S. ground forces in Panama, Major General Richard Anson, both members of our National Security Center Retired Military Officers Advisory Board of 80 officers. Many other retired officers have confirmed this scenario for me. If the Peoples Republic of China, through corporate agents such as COSCO and Hutchison-Whampoa aka Panama Ports Company, decides to quietly move some short range and intermediate range nuclear missiles into Panama and set them up on wheels ready to fire on short notice at the port facilities, the United States might not even know this has happened—unless and until they want us to know.

Other than bland reassurances by the same people who laughed at Ronald Reagan's demand, "Trust but Verify" during negotiations with Mr. Gorbachev, what can Senators offer concerned constituents?

Senators, we desperately need a continued U.S. military presence in Panama. To challenge Red China's new role as Gatekeeper of the Panama Canal. Or else within the next ten years, Chinese will be the new second language of Panama, and our vital security interests at Panama will be secure only at the sufferance of Communist China.

The people of Panama and the United States have worked in harmony for nearly a century, to keep the Panama Canal open, operational and secure. If President Clinton's policy is allowed to stand, the Peoples Republic of China, through Li Ka-shing, China's Red billionaire, will be the unchallenged, unwatched Gatekeeper of the Panama Canal.

I suggest to Senators a range of policy options for immediate adoption. Foremost, any

policy enacted should be done with recognition that the Constitution of the United States empowers our Congress as a co-equal branch of government with the President, not as his subordinate. As a co-equal, that means that acquiescence in the current policy translates into responsibility for what is happening, and for the disastrous catastrophe that faces United States servicemen who will be called upon to fix the problem at the price of their blood in the future.

Second, I suggest to Senators that any policy they enact should be done with recognition that the people of Panama are very interested in continuing to work with the United States, provided we pay a fair rent for military bases, provided we hire back workers who have served as well in the past on a seniority basis and for fair compensation. We should not be turning our backs on our friends in Panama and walking away just because Bill Clinton wants to reenact Vietnam at Panama. If we suggest such a policy, if we respect the sovereignty, the freedom, the economic needs of our friends in Panama, if we make such an offer, in my view, the political leadership of Panama will yield to what the people of Panama want. We will have a future with U.S. servicemen helping keep the Panama Canal open, operational and safe into the future.

In conclusion, I pray that Senators will create a new policy for the U.S. at Panama, one in keeping with these sentiments of Senator Trent Lott, when he called upon Chairman Warner to convene today's Senate Armed Services Committee hearings: "the transfer of control of the Panama Canal is one of the critical national security issues currently facing our nation and its impact will be felt for many generations to come."

HONORING AMERICA'S VETERANS

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, President Calvin Coolidge once said, "The nation which forgets its defenders will be itself forgotten." Last week, Americans proudly celebrated the last Veterans' Day of the century in honor of those brave men and women who so valiantly and selflessly served our great nation during times of peace, confrontation, and war.

Americans owe its brave defenders a tremendous debt indeed—one which will probably never be fully understood by some, nor completely repaid by all. Veterans' Day should reignite year-long gratitude for the sacrifices made in the name of the U.S.A.

We live in a country unrivaled in terms of prosperity, liberty, security, and opportunity. Every child born in America is embraced by a nation blessed with the richest economy in the world, the highest regard for unalienable rights, and the most abundant personal freedom in the history of human civilization.

The comfort, benefits and opportunity we all enjoy, and often take for granted, do not exist but for America's veterans. Commending their service is among our greatest national traditions wherein we all recognize our very liberty has been preserved by their valor and courage.

The veterans' legacy, nearly six decades of domestic tranquility, has ironically and unfortunately fostered an unmistakable complacency among an entire generation unfamiliar with the

horrors of war. While Veterans' Day is first about veterans, Mr. Speaker, it is also about children.

It is the prayer of every veteran I know that each American child may comprehend freedom's price borne by millions of American soldiers over the course of our 223-year history. The liberty we enjoy today has always been an expensive and sacred privilege. Conveying these precepts to America's youth is perhaps the most profound way to honor all veterans.

Veterans also deserve a country committed to providing the benefits and assistance promised in return for defending it. This year, Congress made progress in reversing a troubling trend of woefully underfunded veteran programs. In my opinion it did not go far enough or raise the priority of veterans high enough to counteract the years of neglect.

Mr. Speaker, currently, the median age of America's World War II veterans is 77 years. More than 9 million veterans are 65 years of age or older, accounting for over a third of the veteran population.

Like all aging Americans, these men and women require medical and retirement services, particularly those who sustained permanent and disabling injuries in the line of duty. Resultant long-term medical treatment means staggering medical bills and mounting insurance fees.

After long years of service and patriotism, veterans should be able to count on the rest of us for support. We owe them nothing less. As a Member of Congress, I remain wholly committed to protecting the critical programs serving veterans and retired military members.

In addition to cosponsoring several important measures to ensure adequate Medicare coverage and increased retirement pay for veterans and military retirees, I helped pass the Veteran's Millennium Care Act, which expands veterans' eligibility for health care, and the services they receive. Mr. Speaker, this legislation reinforces new efforts to make certain veterans with severe, service-related disabilities receive the long-term care they require.

This year, Mr. Speaker, as the nation celebrates Veterans' Day, it is important to give thanks and to take inspiration from the great sacrifices of the brave men and women who have delivered our mighty nation. And in commemorating the achievements of America's veterans, we should all recommit our own lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the maintenance of liberty—just as the veterans we now honor have so nobly done.

RECOGNIZING TORNADO RELIEF WORKERS

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend 45 young men, fathers, and boys who invested their time and effort to assist the citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio in recovering from a devastating tornado earlier this year. With hard work and diligence, and at their own expense, these men selflessly served homeowners in clearing debris, removing uprooted trees, and repairing roofs from April 16–30, 1999.